

(SRI KANTA RAO)

working in the Hyderabad area in the scale of Rs. 105-170 (prior to 1-11-1956) been equated to the scale of Rs. 75-180 whereas the scales of pay of the same category of officials of old Mysore 60-150 and Bombay area in the scale of 80-140 have been equated to the scale of Rs. 120-220 in G. O., dated 25-1-1957;

(b) the reasons for the disparity in equations though the posts carry the same responsibility?

A.—Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—

(a) G.O. No. FL (B) 14034-14133/Bud-119-56-3, dated 25-1-1957 does not deal with the equation of posts. It conveys sanction to revised pay scales for different categories of posts of the several Departments in the State.

(b) Does not arise in view of reply to question (a).

Member's Representations.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಚೆನ್ನಬ್ರೆಗ್ಗಾಡ (ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆ).—ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಯ ಕಾಲಾವದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜನ್ಮಾ ಎಂಟು ನಿಖಿಂಘಳ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಚೇರೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಗಳನ್ನು ತಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ದೊಡ್ಡ ಹೆಚ್ (ರೋಣ್).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ಸನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಯನ್ನು; “held over” ವಾದದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅಗ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವೂ ಇದೆ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರು ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇನನ್ನು ಹತ್ತಿರ ಇರಬೇಕಳ್ಳವೇ? The Hon'ble Member will kindly resume his seat. How is anybody to know whether any time will be left over? I asked you to put supplementaries. You did not. Therefore, question time is left over.

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—His suggestion is to put some more questions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am very happy at that. I propose to put in fifteen questions a day in the list of business but there will not be more scope for putting so many supplementaries and the Hon'ble Member must be content with that.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Shravanelagola).—We have agreed to 12 questions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Have not twelve questions been answered today? The

Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition must see the list. I do not make such mistakes. I will ask the office to include fifteen questions hereafter.

Statements by the Minister for Education.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—I request you, Mr. Speaker, to be kind enough to allow me to make two statements.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Important?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I would like to cover some points and with your indulgence I would like to place these two statements before the House, so that I will be in a position to understand the reaction of the House in regard to one or two important matters. That is why I request you to be kind enough to allow me to make these two statements.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

STATEMENT I.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The total expenditure on the Collegiate Education is increasing from year to year consequent on the revision of scales of pay of the teaching staff and increased cost on equipment, buildings etc., while the rate of fees in Government Colleges have remained unchanged for over a decade. With Government's increased commitments on compulsory Primary Education and broad based free education concessions at the secondary education and fast-increasing number of secondary schools, it has become difficult for Government to bear such a high cost on Collegiate Education. The per capita cost on Collegiate Education in this State is higher than in the neighbouring State of Madras.

In the ex-Mysore area, the fees in Government Colleges are the lowest as compared to those charged in Government Colleges in the integrated areas of Coorg and Madras-Karnatak, though all these Colleges in those areas are affiliated to one and the same University viz., the Mysore University. There were representations from

Madras-Karnatak area and Coorg against charging higher rates of fees though the Colleges are affiliated to Mysore University.

In order to do away with this anomaly and to have uniform fee structure for all Government Colleges affiliated to the same University and also to meet the increase in the cost on Collegiate Education, it was considered necessary to enhance the tuition fees in Government Colleges in ex-Mysore area which had remained unchanged for over a decade. It may also be mentioned that the rates of fees levied in Colleges under the Karnatak University are already higher and the revised rates are not thus made applicable to Colleges affiliated to that University.

Primary Education is free at present. Secondary Education is also free in respect of students whose parents' or guardians' income per annum is less than Rs. 1,200. In giving this concession, Government is put to a loss of Rs. 58.37 lakhs per year. The cost on account of free education concession at secondary education level will increase year by year with the growth of student population. The concession at Rs. 1,200 income level benefited 67 per cent of students and concession at Rs. 2,400 income level will benefit an additional 20 per cent thus bringing the total to 87 per cent. Government, in order to give additional benefit, have decided and passed orders to increase free education concession limit up to an income of Rs. 2400 per annum and thus to extend the benefit to more number of students. In enhancing the concession to the income limit, Government will be put to an addition loss of fee income to the extent of Rs 15.23 lakhs per annum. These concessions when granted, would cover the N.G.Os children as well. The question of giving some benefit of free education to Collegiate Education will be examined in the light of the resources available for the purpose.

However, it will be clearly seen that Government with the making of primary education free and compulsory, have also taken steps to make secondary education nearly free and university

education as much available as possible.

STATEMENT II.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The ' Committee on Establishment of New Universities ' appointed the University Grants Commission has observed in its interim report that Bangalore would be one of the most suitable places in the country for the establishment of a new University of federal Unitary type as Bangalore fulfils every condition essential for such a University. The cost pattern of the new University has also been indicated by the Committee in general terms.

Before a decision could be taken by Government on the issue whether a University of a Federal-Unitary type should be established as recommended by the Committee, it should be necessary to have a clear idea of the implications and several aspects of the proposal. A competent Committee will, therefore, have to be set up in the first instance to collect all preliminary data such as statistics relating to student population institutions etc., the location of University, the approximate recurring the non-recurring expenditure and the source of meeting it. It would also be the task of such a Committee to indicate the ways and measures necessary for the establishment of the proposed University. Concrete steps could be taken by the Government on receipt of the report of such a Committee.

The undermentioned members are nominated by Government to from the Committee.

Chairman.

The Minister for Education.

Members.

- 1 Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao
- 2 Education Secretary to Government
- 3 Finance Secretary to Government
- 4 Director of Collegiate Education
- 5 Director of Technical Education
- 6 Director of Public Instruction
- 7 Principal, Central College, Bangalore
- 8 Father D'Souza, Principal, St. Joseph's College, Bangalore.

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

- 9 Sri M. P. L. Sastry, Bangalore
- 10 Sri D'Souza, Retired Vice-Chancellor, Mysore University
- 11 Sri Ganji Veerappa M.L.A.
- 12 Sri S. B. Bondade, Retired Director of Collegiate Education.
- 13 Sri P. Shivashankar, Retired Principal, Law College, Bangalore.
- 14 Deputy Secretary to Government Education Department. (Convener).

2.00 P.M.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—By this fee increase, may I know what would be the annual income of the colleges?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—It is not much. It has not been worked out.

Business of the House.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—This evening the Prime Minister is receiving the Members of the Bangalore Corporation. I request that the House may rise at 5.15 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Some of the Members also came to me and made a similar suggestion. I would like to know the sense of the House.

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—We may rise at about 5.30 P.M. Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It may be 5.30 P.M.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—We may be allowed to go home and come back. Let us rise at five of the Clock. We cannot carry all these books and papers to the reception.

Mr. SPEAKER.—My difficulty is about the arrangement of the business of the House. I want to know from the Education Minister if we can continue the discussion on the demand tomorrow? also. What the Members are saying is that if one hour is lost today, will the Hon'ble Minister reply tomorrow. Or, alternatively, can we dispense with the question hour tomorrow?

(Several members rose)

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I can reply tomorrow if that is the wish of the House. Or the question hour may be dispensed with tomorrow and I will reply within that time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How much time does the Education Minister require?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—One hour. Till 4.30 P.M. the debate may go on and I will reply for half-an-hour and tomorrow I will take another half-an-hour.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think that could be done or you could reply for one hour tomorrow.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I want one more chance to speak because the hon. Minister has made a few remarks on the setting up of a University Board.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition must remember that we deal with one question at a time. Otherwise, my mind gets confused. The question of speaking a second time is a different and distinct issue. Would the Hon. Minister for Education conclude his reply tomorrow within one hour?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—All right, Sir.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I would like to bring to your attention that the hon. Education Minister has raised certain important issues which are not to be found in the demand. So I should be allowed some time to speak on that issue.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think I can allow it. Is the demand being made in your individual capacity or as the Leader of the Opposition? If I give a chance to you now, others will make a similar demand. Unless you think that the members of your party who follow you cannot put the points so effectively as you can as leader, there is no point in my allowing you to speak again. If I given a chance to a member to speak a second time, I will get myself into an embarrassing situation. Other members may say that the time should not be utilised in giving second chances.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I leave the matter to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will look into it.